

REMARKS

[0005] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-4, 10-15 are currently pending
- Claims 16-97 were previously withdrawn herein
- Claim 1 is amended herein

[0006] Support for the amendments to claim 1 is found in the specification at least at page 7, lines 4-8.

Cited Documents

[0007] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Robbin:** Robbin et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2003/0167318
- **Ryan:** Ryan et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2003/0084452
- **Hitson:** Hitson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2002/0010759
- **Palaniappan:** Palaniappan, U.S. Patent No.6,711,557
- **Fischer:** Fischer et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2003/0046448

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

[0008] Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Robbin, in view of Ryan, in view of Hitson, in view of Palaniappan, and in further view of Fischer. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0009] In light of the amendments presented herein, and the above-referenced discussion with the Examiner, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Applicant understood the Examiner to agree that the cited documents do not teach or suggest at least one or more of the following features of amended claim 1:

receiving a request to perform a media operation on a customizable local media platform with respect to a first media file, the customizable local media platform comprising:

a universal media player user interface; and

a display code module configured to:

integrate a first set of one or more display preferences of a first media provider with the universal media player user interface, the first media provider associated with the first media file;

integrate a second set of one or more display preferences of a second media provider with the universal media player user interface, the second media provider associated with a second media file,

wherein the set of one or more display preferences of the second media provider and the second set of one or more display preferences of the first media provider are accessible simultaneously by the universal media player user interface;

determining the first media provider from a plurality of media providers to which the first media file is attributable;

assessing if the first media provider allows the media operation to be performed with respect to the first media file, wherein the assessing is performed by calling an Application Programming Interface (API) associated with a first code module received from the media provider and associated with a requested media operation;

permitting the customizable local media platform to determine if the media operation is allowed without having to further communicate with the first media provider;

performing the requested media operation if allowed by the first media provider; and

denying the requested media operation if not allowed by the first media provider.

[0010] Consequently, the proposed combination of Robbin, in view of Ryan, in view of Hitson, in view of Palaniappan, and in further view of Fischer does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, 10, and 12-15

[0011] Claims 2, 4, 20, and 12-15 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents of record. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 10, and 12-15 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

[0012] For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

[0013] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Kristina M. Kuhnert/

Dated: March 24, 2010

Kristina M. Kuhnert
(kristi@leehayes.com; 509-944-4717)
Registration No. 62665

Reviewer: Andy M. Han
Registration No. 60,266